DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 029 925 UD 005 088

By-Senf, Rita

Bus Transportation to Places of Civic and Cultural Interest in New York City for Disadvantaged Pupils in Nonpublic Schools: Evaluation of New York City Title I Educational Projects 1966-67.

Center for Urban Education, New York, N.Y. Committee on Field Research and Evaluation.
Spons Agency-New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn, N.Y.
Pub Date Sep 67
Note-46p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$2.40
Descriptors-Bus Transportation, *Educational Legislation, *Elementary School Students, Enrichment, *Instructional Trips, *Parochial Schools, Program Administration, Program Descriptions, Program Effectiveness, *Program Evaluation, Program Improvement
Identifiers-Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I, ESEA Title I, New York City

Evaluated is the first year of operation of a program of educational bus trips to provide enrichment of New York City children in parochial elementary schools. Funded by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) Title I, the project used buses provided by the Board of Education. Appraisal of the program was based on interviews with the children, teachers responses to questionnaires, and information from principals. The main recommendation is that one person in each school should be responsible for screening trip requests and for supervising all arrangements. In addition, it appears that some teachers need more help in relating trips and sites to curriculum. For a history and description of ESEA Title I in New York City, 1965-1968, see UD 007 904. (NH)

ED029925

05088 E

EVALUATION OF NEW YORK CITY TITLE I

EDUCATIONAL PROJECTS 1966-67

BUS TRANSPORTATION TO PLACES OF CIVIC AND CULTURAL INTEREST IN NEW YORK CITY FOR DISADVANTAGED PUPILS IN NONPUBLIC SCHOOLS

By Rita Senf

September 1967

UD 005 088

The Center For Urban Education
33 West 42nd St., New York, N.Y. 10036

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Center for Urban Education
33 West 42nd Street
New York, New York 10036

BUS TRANSPORTATION TO PLACES OF CIVIC AND CULTURAL INTEREST IN NEW YORK CITY FOR DISADVANTAGED PUPILS IN NONPUBLIC SCHOOLS

Rita Senf

Evaluation of a New York City school district educational project funded under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (PL 89-10), performed under contract with the Board of Education of the City of New York for the 1966-67 school year.

UD 005 088

Committee on Field Research and Evaluation
Joseph Krevisky, Assistant Director

September 1967

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The writer wishes to thank Mr. John Hassett of the Board of Education for his cooperative assistance. He volunteered much helpful information and gave free access to his files.

Thanks are also expressed to the observers - May Engler, Barbara Pogue, Laura Merit, Barbara Levy, and Joseph Krevisky; and to the school principals and teachers for their cooperation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	page
Description of the Project	1
Evaluation Design	2
Description of Instruments	3
Findings and Recommendations	4
Appendix A: Tables	A1
Appendix B: Instruments	B1
Appendix C: Staff List	C1

DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECT

This project was intended to provide enrichment experiences by means of bus trips for disadvantaged children in grades three through eight in nonpublic schools. This is the first year of operation of such a program in these schools. Trips during the regular school day were held between January and June. The Board of Education furnished busses and sent periodic bulletins to the schools giving information on possible sites and on planning of trips. All necessary arrangements, such as reservations, bridge tolls, parking and admission fees, lunch, and adult supervision, were the responsibility of the participating schools.

The project description listed 204 schools with approximately 67,000 eligible children. With children three to a seat and adults two to a seat, each bus had a capacity of 54 children and 4 adults; busses were allotted on this basis, with provision for three trips per pupil in each school. The Board of Education suggested that the trips be taken in three series, namely, January or February, March or April, and May or June. Thus a school with a quota of four busses per series could take a total of 12 busloads of children on trips. Alternatively, however, the school could use all 12 busses during one time period, depending of course on their availability. The maximum duration of each trip was five hours, since the busses were transporting public school children at other times. Within these time limits the trip site could be anywhere in the five boroughs of New York City.

Each school specified the trip destination on a trip request form, and busses were assigned in order of receipt of request. Schools could cancel a bus up to 4 P.M. of the day preceding the trip. Schools were urged to fill the busses; therefore the children on any one bus could be from different classes or grades.

A similar program was operating in the public schools, and busses from public schools were making trips at the same times to some of the same destinations. A subsidiary aim of this project was "to provide the maximum commingling of public and nonpublic school pupils during these trips." To accomplish this aim, the Board of Education attempted to schedule public and nonpublic school trips concurrently to the same destinations, so that the children could "meet at the center of local interest and participate in the program together."

EVALUATION DESIGN

For this evaluation, observations of selected trips began in March, at which time children would probably have had no more than two trips. It could not be expected that individual children, as a result of one or two bus trips, would show immediate measurable changes with respect to standard criteria such as classroom performance or attitudes toward learning; therefore the evaluation focussed on the reactions of children to the trips and the impressions of teachers and principals.

There were five observers, four female and one male. All had previous teaching or interviewing experience; three had previously

accompanied their own children on public school bus trips.

Observers accompanied selected trips from the time the bus left the school until it returned. The observations were fairly evenly spread over grades three through eight. The sample was selected by religious denomination so that it was representative of the total population of schools. This evaluation is based on data from a total of 39 observed trips (32 Catholic, 4 Hebrew, 2 Greek Orthodox, 1 Episcopal), involving 28 different schools. That is, in 11 schools two trips were observed on the same day.

DESCRIPTION OF INSTRUMENTS

The four instruments are included in Appendix B. The observer's form provided for descriptions of events and for interviews with five different children at each of three periods: from school to trip site, at the trip site, and the return from site to school. Two separate questionnaires secured comments from the 39 teachers in charge of busses and from the 28 school principals. The observer delivered these two questionnaires personally. If there was time, the teacher and principal completed them on the day of the trip; if not, they mailed the forms back soon afterward. A followup questionnaire for the teacher in charge of the bus was mailed in June only to schools observed early in the series and only to teachers who accompanied their own classes; returns were received from none teachers.

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The findings will be presented in the following order: first a general description of the circumstances of the trips, based mainly on information from observers and principals; next, the results of the interviews with children, and comparative data from the teachers; other information from teachers secured on the day of the trip and at followup; and finally other information from principals.

General Description of the Trips

The observed trips lasted approximately $4\frac{1}{2}$ to 5 hours, except for those involving the Hebrew schools, which lasted approximately 2 hours. Typical destinations for third and fourth graders were the Bronx Zoo, Aquarium, and Museum of Natural History; and for seventh and eighth graders, the Metropolitan Museum of Art, Lincoln Center, and the United Nations building. Some schools traveled fairly great distances, for example, from Brooklyn to the Bronx Zoo or from Queens to the Statue of Liberty. Four of the 39 trips visited two sites during one trip, such as Lincoln Center and the Cathedral of St. John the Divine; here the distances traveled were necessarily shorter.

Many trips included the lunch hour, but no problems were reported for children on a free lunch program. Principals used a variety of alternatives; sometimes children brought a bag lunch, parents groups provided box lunches, lunch was saved by the school cafeteria, or occasionally the school paid for lunches. Any problems that arose

were due to lack of prior consideration of available luncheon facilities by the school staff, and consideration of whether the facilities were outdoor or indoor ones. A group at the U.N. on a rainy day had brought lunches, but building rules did not permit their eating indoors. Another group at the Cloisters had to eat outdoors while walking in the rain. The number of children on the observed trips ranged from 29 to 53, with a median of 43. It should be noted that many Catholic schools have single classes of 40 to 50 or more children, and about half the observed trips involved classes of this size. The observers commented that for older children, placing three to a seat made for crowded conditions; some teachers and principals made the same comment. Therefore, taking grade level into account, the bus capacity was fairly fully utilized.

If commingling is taken to mean the presence of public and nonpublic school children at the same site, this occurred in most cases. If the word is taken to mean opportunities for personal interaction among children from different schools, these opportunities were very limited. On only five trips was there any evidence of such interaction, and when it did occur it was minimal. Here are two examples: At a Randall's Island Police Demonstration, "after the program the children were allowed to go onto the field to see the helicopter and vehicles at close range." On a trip to the Statue of Liberty, they mingled "slightly, while waiting to board the ferry, on the ferry, and at lunch." With such large groups of children as were involved here, the objective of

getting public and nonpublic school children to interact appears unrealistic.

Besides the teacher in charge and the observer on each of these trips, there were typically one or two additional adults, usually parents, occasionally other teachers. Eight of the trips had no additional adults, and 11 had three to five additional adults. The Board of Education had stated that adult supervision was the school's responsibility; the number of adults needed depended on the number of children and the site. At some sites the rules permit a tour guide to take a group of no more than 10 children, who must be accompanied by an adult. In a few instances when there were not enough adults, observers filled this role so that the children could tour the site.

Principals were asked how they secured parent volunteers to accompany trips and whether parents were cooperative in response to these requests. In almost every case the principals indicated that parents were cooperative, but only 9 of the 28 specified a definite method of recruiting parents. Principals commented to observers that they could easily have secured more parents to accompany trips if they had realized more adults would be desirable or necessary. One princiapl, accounting for two observed trips that had no additional adults, said that they recruited no parents because the teachers felt they could control the children better without the parents along. In support of her view, one of these two trips was extremely orderly; on the other the children were somewhat noisy but in general they behaved well.

Almost all the observed trips involved single intact classes; in a few cases there was more than one class or grade on the bus, usually in small schools such as the Hebrew ones. For one school the Board of Education made an exception to the grade limits so that the whole school (total enrollment of 48 in kindergarten through seventh grade) went to the Staten Island Zoo. Generally, however, the teacher in charge of the bus was taking her own class to a site she had selected; sometimes the children participated in this decision. Thus she had the opportunity to orient her students in advance as to the educational purposes of the trip and to make class use of the experience after the trip. Therefore it will be meaningful later to examine the extent to which she did so.

Both observers and principals reported very few discipline problems; in general the children seemed excited about the trip but behaved well. Older children sometimes tended to be noisy, particularly on the return trip. Younger children were often tired, and therefore quiet, toward the end of a five-hour trip.

As one indicator of the children's interest in the site, observers recorded the number of references to the trip site that they overheard in the children's conversations on the ride to and from the site. This recording may be somewhat unreliable, since the observer could not move around freely on the bus and could not hear at times when the children were very noisy nor when they spoke very quietly. On 15 of the 39 trips observers overheard more references to the site on the return trip than on the trip to the site (median, +2; range +1 to +8). On 4 trips they recorded fewer references

to the site (median, -1; range, -1 to -2).

Another way of estimating the children's reactions is by considering their verbally expressed interest at the site. Observers recorded their impressions and the specific questions children asked at the site; from this information the amount of interest was rated as great, moderate, or little. On 31 trips the children appeared greatly interested; for example, a fourth-grade group at the Museum of Natural History "answered all questions asked by the guide in the talk before the tour and during the tour." In only two cases were the children rated as uninterested; for example, a seventh-grade group at the Staten Island Zoo "didn't look at the animals at all. They did not seem interested in the zoo but only in the ferry trip (to Staten Island)."

Interviews with Children

In evaluating children's interview responses, several factors need to be kept in mind. Children went to different sites and had differing amounts of preparation for the trip. The observer was a stranger to the children, and this may have inhibited some children's verbalizations. Also, verbalizations would clearly be affected by grade level. In connection with this factor, some responses were rated as to quality, as will be described below. Since it was found that good responses were not restricted to upper grades nor poor responses to lower grades, and since the total sample was relatively small, the same rating system was applied to all responses to a given question regardless of differences in age, site, and so forth.

However, because of the effects of variations in these factors, arithmetic means of ratings were not calculated; data will be reported in terms of frequencies.

Observers tried to interview five children during each of the three periods: on bus to site, at the site, and on bus returning to school. (For the exact questions, see the observer's form in Appendix B.) Thus there could be a possible total of 39 times 5, or 195 interviews at each period. Observers actually completed 194, 193, and 192 interviews during the respective periods, and these totals constitute the base for the percentages reported in this section.

Most of the children were able to state the exact trip destination; 10 per cent could not do so, but of these, several clearly knew something about what they were going to see, as indicated by their subsequent responses. For example, a fourth-grade boy on a trip to the Cloisters said he was going to "the Planetarium," but he remembered that his teacher said "there are treasures on long, long ago."

Observers asked children what they expected to see; responses were scored on a five-point scale, with 5 indicating considerable knowledge about the site and 1 indicating no knowledge. Good responses came from children at all grade levels; 32 per cent gave responses scored 4 or 5. Following are some examples of such responses. A third-grade girl going to the Bronx Zoo said she expected to see "animals - snakes, zebras, gorillas, and squirrels." A fourth-grade boy going to the Metropolitan Museum of Art expected

to see "Egyptian and Roman paintings and tombs," and an eighth-grade boy expected to see "different kinds of arts; man's history through art."

Teachers in their questionnaire were asked how they had prepared the children, and observers asked children what their teacher had told the class beforehand about the trip site. Thus the two sets of data can be compared. Of the 39 teachers, 15 or 38 per cent gave special preparation, such as extra reading assignments or special discussions or projects. For example, for a third-grade trip to the Bronx Zoo, the teacher prepared the children "with discussion on and reading about characteristics and habits of birds, etc. We also paid particular attention to appropriate programs on Channel 13." Seventeen teachers (44 per cent) gave an intermediate amount of preparation, and seven (18 per cent) reported no preparation other than discussing routine procedures and expected behavior. Since not every trip involved intact classes, there is not a perfect correspondence between a teacher's statement of preparation given and the child's report of what his teacher told his class. In most instances, however, it is legitimate to make this comparison, and it is clear that when the teacher gave good preparation, the children retained the information, of course in varying degrees. For a fourth-grade class going to the United Nations, the teacher prepared the children by means of "lecture, discussion, and library books." The five children interviewed from her class gave the following responses:

Child A (Puerto Rican girl): (Expect to see) "the flags of the world, and all the famous people." (The teacher) "said the same things I'm telling you. There are five languages, French, Spanish, English, Russian. She said all about 47th Street and the buildings and you don't notice when you go from building to building because they're connected."

Child B: (Expect to see) "I don't know." (The teacher) "told us things like they're going to put the earphones on, what number, that language, what to wear, and to look nice."

Child C: (Expect to see) "many secret things and the shop; different things, I don't know exactly; I've never been there." (The teacher said) "that there are two buildings, the General Assembly and the Secretariat. She said we will see ambassadors going down through the halls and they might be going to a meeting."

Child D: (Expect to see) "I don't know." (The teacher) "was talking about the things that are going to be there, that there are going to be African people. She said that there are five languages, Spanish, English, French, I don't know the others. She said about the General something, I forget."

Child E: (Expect to see) "souvenirs; things of different countries." (The teacher) "was telling us about the five languages, and that the person that done these languages was up in the stage; and you see them walking around. Maybe we'll be in a meeting."

In contrast to the fourth-grade class above, the effect of little preparation can be seen in a seventh-grade class that went to Lincoln Center and the Cathedral of St. John the Divine. The teacher reported that "this time I didn't have much opportunity to do an extensive preparation." Three of the five children interviewed could not remember having been told anything about the trip sites. All five gave minimal responses when asked what they expected to see; the best of these was "things of art and music."

A great majority of these children (81 per cent) remembered taking one or more previous bus trips - not necessarily a Title I

trip. In three of the 28 schools the observed trip was the first Title I trip. Of the children who remembered a previous trip, most (87 per cent) could report some details of what they had seen; 17 per cent of them remembered some special followup in class, such as a project, composition, or test.

The children were mostly going to places they had never seen before. Those who reported visiting the trip site previously (17 per cent) included a few young children whose parents had taken them to the zoo, older children who had been on previous school trips to a museum, and Yeshiva children who had made previous trips to the matzoh factory. Teachers' and principals' reports corroborated this interview information; they often volunteered the comment that the trips made it possible for the children to see things that they would otherwise have no opportunity to encounter. "It was discovered that some children had never been on a boat. They <u>discovered</u> New York Harbor, an island (Statue of Liberty), downtown New York, Battery Park; all were educational."

Observers asked children whether they had any questions they wanted answered about the site, and what interested them most at the site. Four-fifths reported no questions to the observer (but remember that she or he was a stranger to them); the remaining one-fifth raised from one to three questions about the site. The child's statement of what interested him most was again rated on a five-point scale, ranging from no specification of interest (scored 1) to great interest, defined as being "able to describe more than one thing observed and make a comment that involves reasoning"

(scored 5). Thirty-six children (19 per cent) gave responses scored 4 or 5. The following are examples: Eighth-grade girl at U.N.: "I would like to come when the General Assembly is in session, to hear all the languages." Fourth-grade boy at Museum of Natural History: "The dinosaurs and the whales (interest me most). I like to study about the bones of animals. I like to collect material about dinosaurs and I like to read books about dinosaurs." Seventh-grade boy at Metropolitan Museum of Art: "The sculpture of the people, the way they were carved, because the people who made them really put feeling in them." Thirteen children (7 per cent) mentioned no specific things that interested them, and six of these responses were from children visiting the matzoh factory. Two examples of such responses follow: (What interests you most?) "All of it; I never saw it before." "Everything."

On the bus returning to the school, observers asked children whether they would like to visit the same site again and why. All but 18 (9 per cent) said they would like to return, and gave reasons. For example, a third-grade girl returning from the Bronx Zoo said, "Because we didn't see all the animals and I d like to see more;" a fourth-grade boy returning from the Cloisters and Fort Tryon Park said, "Because a lot of people think New York is just buildings and concrete. It's good to see trees. You have a nice view of the bridge. I'd like to live there." Two eighth-grade boys returning from Lincoln Center said, "Yes, to see something performed - a play;" and "Yes, I want to see it in action." The few children who did not want to return to the same site included several older children

who went to the Statue of Liberty; one girl said, "No, because there's nothing really to see, only the boat, that's the best."

To determine whether they had any understanding of the geography of the trip, children were asked how they would get back to the site if they had to go by themselves. Their answers showed little knowledge of the geographical location; only 12 per cent gave a response indicating that they could probably get back alone, and these usually involved minimal knowledge; for example, "I'd look for a bus that said 'to Staten Island.'"

Children were asked, "Would you like to go on more of these trips to other places?" (If so) "Where?" The 192 children gave 347 responses; these are tabulated in Appendix A, Table 1. No child said "no" to the first question. To the question "Where?", 28 children (15 per cent) could not name a possible site, but gave such responses as "I don't know where, but I would like to go;" "all the trips the school would go on;" and (fourth-grade boy) "without the girls, anywhere." The question did not limit responses to "places of civic and cultural interest," and the responses of the other 85 per cent of the children covered a wide gamut of both educational and entertaining sites, and great distances. Five per cent of the responses (N=17) were unspecific as to site; for example, "other interesting places where I could learn something;" "educational places and maybe one fun place;" and "a field trip to be in the country."

Of the remaining 302 responses, about five-sixths were primarily educational choices and one-sixth were primarily oriented toward enter-

tainment. The fact that most responses were educationally oriented could be considered an indication that most children appreciated the educational aim of the trips.

Of the entertainment-oriented responses, the most popular choices were Palisades Park (N = 19) and beaches (N = 17). Baseball games and the circus were also mentioned.

There were 19 responses expressing a wish to revisit the same site or one previously visited; for example, "here (Metropolitan Museum of Art), because I didn't see everything."

By far the most frequent educationally-oriented choice was museums (N = 89). Other frequent choices included specific buildings (e.g., Empire State, St. Patrick's Cathedral, Coca Cola factory); parks (e.g., Central Park, Bear Mountain); and specific locations (e.g., Chinatown, Rhode Island, Boston, Washington, D. C., Expo 67, "Florida and Israel"). These three categories received 38, 33, and 32 mentions respectively. Industrial sites were rarely mentioned (N = 3).

The lack of geographical knowledge previously referred to is confirmed by the responses categorized under "specific locations or areas." As part of the preparation of children, these trips could well be used to provide instruction not only in geography but also in map reading and the relation between distances and travel time.

Observers asked the children what they had learned on the trip; 79 per cent were able to specify something about what they had learned. The following are examples:

Metropolitan Museum of Art: Fourth-grade girl: (I learned) "that the Romans and Egyptians had certain materials that they liked to sculpture with." Eighth-grade boy: (I learned) "how to really look at a painting."Eighth-grade boy: (I learned) "different things about early man. I didn't know he was all that creative."

Matzoh Factory: Seven-year-old boy: (in response to the question, Did you learn anything on this trip?): "No. I saw it last year." Third-grade girl, same question: "Not yet, because it was too short and he didn't let me see anything." In this case the observer commented: "The teachers did not attempt to make the tour interesting for the children. The children could not hear, so they did not know what was happening. The teachers walked at the head of the group talking to each other and explained nothing to the girls."

United Nations: Eighth-grade girl giving contradictory reponses: (Would you like to go there again?) "Yes. It was interesting and I learned a lot."...(Did you learn anything?) "Not really. I knew most things already."

Bronx Zoo: Third-grade boy: "About the birds - about the birds. I never knew the peacock opened its wings before."

Hall of Science: Sixth-grade girl: "Man can do whatever he wants if he puts his mind to it, and go wherever he wants in the universe."

Information from Teachers' Questionnaires

All teachers reported that they knew beforehand where and when they would be going on the bus trip; the median was four weeks' advance notice. Thus in general they had sufficient time to plan and prepare for the trip. Almost all teachers knew something about the site before the trip, said that they and the children enjoyed the trip, and considered the trip valuable and well suited to the children's needs and interests.

Both teachers and principals tended to state the educational purposes of the trip in broad general terms for younger children and in more specific terms for older children. The same thing was

true of the teachers' replies when asked, "Was there anything about this trip that you can relate to class work? What? How?" A teacher stated the purpose of a third-grade trip to the Bronx Zoo as being "to see live animals and learn their names." An eighth-grade trip to Lincoln Center and the Cathedral of St. John the Divine was seen as an opportunity for "knowledge and appreciation of the performing arts; recognition of different architectural structures."

In terms of relating the trip to class work, one-third of the teachers described a specific tie with the curriculum; for example, for a third-grade trip to the Bronx Zoo, "Part of third-grade science demands a study of reptiles, mammals, and birds, so the children get a first-hand look at some of these, even though a brief one." One-third of the teachers mentioned general subject matter; for example, "Science - different animals; English - paragraphs; geography - Manhattan and Bronx; social studies - how to act in public." The remaining third of the teachers reported generalizations without any specific statement about curriculum; for example, "the Statue of Liberty is an important historical point of interest."

Teachers' replies as to how the educational value of the trips could be increased stressed the importance of more preparation and followup. They specified a need for more advance knowledge of the site on the part of both the teacher and the child, by such means as literature, film strips, discussions, and reports. A few teachers and principals requested annotated lists of sites suitable for particular age groups. It was not clear from the teachers' replies to what extent they would in future take the initiative to get necessary

information; Some seemed to imply that they felt more information should be furnished to them. At any rate, the information sent by the Board of Education to the principals evidently was not read or was not heeded by some teachers.

Two-thirds of the teachers had no criticisms or suggestions about the program. Of those who did, the most frequent suggestions were for more time (than five hours), and more busses or smaller groups. Only one teacher suggested including the second grade, but of course all these teachers taught higher grades than that.

The followup questionnaire to the teachers focussed mainly on the observed trip. Of the nine teachers who responded, all but one discussed the trip afterwards with the class. The one who did not commented, "I feel it would be good to give a project ahead of time so that the students would meet something at least that was familiar." Five teachers assigned written reports or special projects. An example of the kind of followup is: "We had a class discussion and they compared the Staten Island Zoo with the Bronx Zoo. They especially talked about the beautiful homes and gardens they had seen in Staten Island."

When they were asked at the end of the school year how their ideas on preparing children for trips had changed, most of the teachers again emphasized the importance of giving prior orientation about the site. Examples of responses are: "It made me realize that the trip was educational and very advantageous to the children." "A knowledge of the things they are going to see will help children enjoy the trip. These field trips arouse interest in learning."

"Personally, I prefer to have definite literature on places to be visited. You can read it before time and then when the children ask questions you are ready for them." One teacher commented that she would like advance information about the route to be followed by the bus so that she could be prepared to point out to the students any interesting sights along the way.

At followup all teachers reported positive reactions from the children. "The children enjoyed (the U. N.) and were very interested in it. Now with the U.N. constantly in the headlines, it is easier for them to understand. " (Fifth-grade) "students showed interest in magnets and their use." Eight of the nine teachers reported receiving reactions from parents, all positive. "They were most grateful. They remarked they preferred a bus to a subway since they stay closer as a group. They love their children to get out of Harlem for a day."

Other Information from Principals' Questionnaires

Principals were asked what kind of orientation teachers received concerning bus trips; 23 replied to this question. Their replies are not easily categorizable since they show great variability; however, 13 principals indicated that they oriented teachers by discussing the trips with them. The form and content of the orientation was not clear from the replies. Some principals said that general discussions were limited to giving information on routine procedures and that other aspects were discussed individually with teachers. Six principals said most teachers had prior knowledge of the sites, and seemed to imply therefore, that no

orientation was needed or given. Five said that teachers "had access" to descriptive literature from the Board of Education and mentioned no other method of orientation. Several principals stressed the need for preparation and followup. "On our part we intend to do more projects beforehand. We found this extremely helpful before our visit to the U. N. (and Botanical Gardens). Oral discussions and drawings have been used as followups. The teacher must motivate and pave the way prior to the trip."

Principals were asked how they reached decisions concerning trip sites and how they screened requests or conferred with teachers about the suitability of sites for particular grades; 26 replied. The responses were scored simply in terms of how active a role the principal played in the making of decisions; 13 took an active part, 11 took a more passive review role, and 2 delegated this function to a deputy. In effect, then, in half these schools the teacher made her own decision, subject to the principal's review.

All principals reported positive reactions from teachers about the educational value of the trips. One said, "There are problems only if the teacher has not fully prepared for her trip." A typical response is this: "I find that the teachers, as well as the students, are enjoying these trips, for many have never visited these places of interest."

Principals reported uniformly positive reactions from parents about the trips. The following examples convey the general tone of the replies: "Most parents expressed their gratitude. Children

made them so enthusiastic that they decided to go themselves sometime." "Those (parents) who have accompanied us were delighted with the reactions of the children. These have been great experiences for many, many children. They have truly profited by these trips educationally and culturally and have behaved well."

No question was asked about the bus drivers, but principals volunteered comments like this: "The drivers have been very cooperative and have aided in making our trips very enjoyable."

Most of these schools had made very few previous Title I trips. When asked for possible sites, many principals indicated that they would continue to choose from the Board of Education's listed suggestions. Some recommended industrial sites "for vocational motivation," such as factories, newspapers, Telephone Company, Stock Exchange, Federal Reserve Bank, and tours of ships or planes. Another frequent choice was nonurban sites: "I would like trips to the country, to a farm or dairy, as these city children have no idea of country life." At some interesting sites the admission fee is prohibitive in these schools. One principal requested that drivers avoid toll bridges where possible.

Because of the large size of most of the classes, few principals had an opportunity to mix different grades on the same bus. But whether they did or not, most of them preferred not to mix grades, and stated definite educational reasons for not doing so. Only 4 of the 28 said they considered such mixing an asset; as expressed by one principal, "We have mixed different levels and it was an asset. The older children developed a sense of

responsibility for the younger ones."

Principals were enthusiastic about the program; without exception they wanted it to be continued or expanded. Their suggestions are shown in Appendix A, Table 2. Nine principals requested no changes of any kind. Some asked for more trips per year and for inclusion of younger children. One said, "I think in our particular area, it would be greatly profitable to allow grades 1 and 2 on trips. This might help vocabulary, learning experiences, social behavior." Requests to permit trips outside the city were mainly for the purpose of providing nonurban experiences, as mentioned above, and often phrased as "just one trip a year." A few comments reflected misinterpretations on the part of the principals as to what the Board of Education could do, such as asking that lunch facilities or tour guides be provided at sites that do not have them. Not everyone knew that Kennedy Airport is within the city limits and that busses did go there.

Summary of Recommendations

Considering that this was the first year of operation of the program, the teachers' and principals' responses cited above make it clear that as a result of this year's experience they will be much more competent about handling future trips. An interesting aspect of the children's responses is that they reveal many broader values of the trips than those associated solely with the particular sites visited.

Some teachers need more help with relating trips and sites to curriculum and with taking initiative in preparing themselves and the children for the trip. Rather than furnishing standard lists or guides, such help could be given in the form of a more general orientation on selection of sites and ways of relating them to curriculum at various age levels. Greater use of industrial sites, especially for older children, seems worthy of consideration by school staffs. Hebrew schools could provide a greater variety of sites.

The main recommendation that emerges from these results is that each school should centralize the responsibility for the screening of trip requests and the checking of planning and arrangements in one person, whether that be the principal or an assigned deputy. This person could insure that proper consideration is given to all the details, as suggested throughout this report, that contribute to the efficient operation of a trip. Since there is bound to be turnover in school personnel, such a person could also be helpful in orienting new staff to the planning of trips.

For the coming year, the Board of Education has proposed modifications, with special emphasis on planning; to quote from the "Summary of Proposed Programs, 1967-68":

"The following suggestions from the interim evaluation report have been incorporated into this program:

1. An attempt will be made to stress maximum utilization of all busses and to plan trips more carefully.

2. Orientation sessions will be held for the principals of nonpublic schools or their representatives participating in the program. The topics of trip planning, bus utilization,

and adult supervision will be discussed at these sessions.

3. Periodic bulletins will be sent to participating schools with helpful materials for trip planning."

TABLE 1

TYPES OF RESPONSES GIVEN BY 192 CHILDREN WHEN ASKED WHAT OTHER TRIPS THEY WOULD LIKE TO TAKE[a]

No. of children giving response	
89	Museums (e.g., Brooklyn Museum, Planetarium, Guggenheim)
38	Specific buildings (e.g., Empire State, Rockefeller Center, Coliseum, Library, Con Edison)
33	Parks (e.g., Central Park, Prospect Park, Bear Mountain)
32	Specific locations or areas (e.g., Coney Island, Long Island, Fort Jay, Boston)
20	Zoos, Aquarium, Marineland
19	Revisit the same site or one previously visited
13	Statue of Liberty
4	Plays, movies, science movies
19	Palisades Park
17	Beaches (e.g., Rye Beach, Coney Island beach; Red Hook pool)
7	Picnics; bazaars, fairs
6	Baseball games, Shea Stadium, Yankee Stadium
5	Circus
17	Unspecified locations (e.g., "places with culture," "places where you can see flowers from all over the world")
28	No site specified (e.g., "I don't know where, but I would like to go")
347	Total responses

a. The exact question was, "Would you like to go on more of these trips to other places?" "Where?"

TABLE 2

SUGGESTIONS BY 28 PRINCIPALS ABOUT CONTINUING OR EXPANDING THE PROGRAM

No. Principals giving response	
9	No changes desired
8	Include trip (s) outside New York City (e.g., to a farm, to West Point)
6	Include younger children than grade 3
5	More trips per year
5	More time per trip (e.g., 9:30 to 4:30)
2	More busses per trip or fewer children per bus (e.g., "Only 40 children grades 5 to 8 fit in a bus")
1	More busses for shorter trips
1	Trips during July and August
37	Total responses

Appendix B - INSTRUMENTS

BUS TRANSPORTATION TO PLACES OF CIVIC AND CULTURAL INTEREST IN NEW YORK CITY FOR DISADVANTAGED PUPILS IN NONPUBLIC SCHOOLS

List of Instruments

Educational Bus Trip Observation	B1
Teacher's Questionnaire	B8
Principal's Questionnaire	B10
Followup Questionnaire	B13

Center for Urban Education
33 West 42nd Street
New York, N.Y. 10036

Title I Evaluations

Educational Bus Trip Observation

Trip Site _____ School _____

Grade(s) on bus _____ _____

Time bus left school _____ _____

Time bus returned to school _____ Principal _____

Observer _____ Date _____

Section I. From School to Trip Site

Name of teacher in charge of bus _____

Other teachers on bus _____

_____

If no others, check here _____

Number of parents on bus _____

If none, check here _____

If there were any other adults (besides observer and driver), specify who they were: _____

_____

Number of children on bus _____

Sex of children on bus:

Boys only _____

Girls only _____

Boys and girls _____

Note: On original questionnaires, questions calling for extended comments allowed considerably more space than is shown here.

1. Did the process of getting the children on the bus go smoothly? Comment on anything unusual that happened during the loading.

2. Indicate the grade and class composition of the children on the bus. Was the class of the teacher in charge on the bus? Were there intact classes or were classes separated?

3. After listening to several of the children's conversations, list the topics of as many of the conversations as you can.

4. What methods did the adult in charge use to maintain control over the children? How successful was he?

5. Did the children seem excited about the trip, or was their excitement more at simply being out of school?

Interview with Children on Bus

A. Child's Name_____ Grade____

1. Do you know where you are going? (Where?)_____

2. What do you expect to see?

3. Did your teacher spend any time in class talking about the trip? What did she tell you about it?

4. What bus trips have you gone on before this one?

5. (If there were previous trips) What did you see there?

6. Did you talk about (site of previous trip) afterwards in class? What was said?

B. Child's Name_____ Grade____

1. Do you know where you are going? (Where?)_____

2. What do you expect to see?

3. Did your teacher spend any time in class talking about the trip? What did she tell you about it?

4. What bus trips have you gone on before this one?

5. (If there were previous trips) What did you see there?

6. Did you talk about (site of previous trip) afterwards in class? What was said?

(Form repeated for C, D, and E.)

Section II. At Trip Site

1. Did the group of children from the bus remain intact? If not, how were they separated?

2. In the group you accompanied at the site, state:

   No. children_____

   Grade_____

   Sex_____

   Adults (specify--tour guide, teacher, parent, etc.):

   _____

   _____

3. What methods did the adult in charge use to maintain control over the children? How successful was he?

4. In what ways did the children express interest in the trip site? List any questions they asked.

5. In what aspects of the trip site did the children appear most interested?

6. Was there any evidence that the children became more involved with one another because of sharing a common interest in an aspect of the trip site?

7. Was there any evidence of commingling with children from other schools? If so, how did this occur? (During lunch, film program, etc.)

Interview with Children at Trip Site

F. Child's Name_____ Grade____

1. Have you ever been here before?
   (If yes, find out under what circumstances - school trip, with parents, etc.)

2. Did you tell your mother or father where you were going today?
   (Find out what was said by child or parents.)

3. Which things interest you the most? Why?

4. Do you have any questions that you hope to have answered during this trip?
   (List them.)

G. Child's Name_____ Grade____

1. Have you ever been here before?
   (If yes, find out under what circumstances - school trip, with parents, etc.)

2. Did you tell your mother or father where you were going today?
   (Find out what was said by child or parents.)

3. Which things interest you the most? Why?

4. Do you have any questions that you hope to have answered during this trip?
   (List them.)

(Form repeated for H, I, and J.)

Section III. Return from Trip Site to School

1. Was the group on the bus the same as before? If not, indicate the changes.

2. Did the process of getting the children on the bus go smoothly? Comment on anything unusual that happened during the loading. Compare with start of trip.

3. After listening to several of the children's conversations, list the topics of as many of the conversations as you can.

4. What methods did the adult in charge use to maintain control over the children? How successful was he? (More or less than previously?)

5. Comment on any unusual circumstances during the trip.

Interview with Children on Return Bus Trip

K. Child's Name_____ Grade____

1. Would you like to go to (name of trip site) again? Why?

2. How would you get back to (name of trip site) if you had to get there by yourself? (Probe for detail.)

3. Did you learn anything on this trip? What?

4. Would you like to go on more of these trips to other places? Where?

L. Child's Name_____ Grade____

1. Would you like to go to (name of trip site) again? Why?

2. How would you get back to (name of trip site) if you had to get there by yourself? (Probe for detail.)

(Form repeated for M, N, and O.)

3. Did you learn anything on this trip? What?

4. Would you like to go on more of these trips to other places? Where?

Center for Urban Education
33 West 42 Street
New York, N.Y. 10036

Title I Evaluations

Educational Bus Trips

Teacher's Questionnaire

Teacher_____ School_____

Grade Taught_____ Trip Site_____

Date_____

1. How long before today did you know just where and when you were going on this trip?

2. Did you have any choice concerning where to go on this trip? In what way?

3. Did you know in advance what was to be seen at the trip site?

4. How did you prepare your pupils in advance for this trip?

5. Did you enjoy the trip? Why?

6. How did the children indicate enjoyment or lack of enjoyment of the trip?

7. Do you think these kinds of trips are valuable? Why?

8. Do you think the children learned anything on this trip? What?

9. Was there anything about this trip that you can relate to class work? What? How?

10. Was this trip suited to the needs and interests of this particular group? Please comment.

11. What were the educational purposes of this trip?

12. How could the educational value of these trips be increased?

13. Can you suggest some places that you think would be valuable for your class to visit?

14. What criticisms do you have of the bus trip program in general?

15. What suggestions can you offer for improving the bus trip program?

Center for Urban Education
33 West 42 Street
New York, N.Y. 10036

Title I Evaluations

Educational Bus Trips

Principal's Questionnaire

Principal_____ Total No. of Busses Today:_____

School_____ Grades Involved Today:_____

Date_____ Trip Destination(s) Today:_____

_____

1. What kind of orientation do teachers get concerning bus trips?

2. How do teachers prepare in advance for a visit to a particular site?

3. Does each classroom teacher accompany her own class?

4. If lunch is included in a trip, what provision is made for children who are on a free lunch program?

5. How do you recruit parent volunteers to go on bus trips?

6. Are the parents cooperative in response to these requests?

7. Do any parents refuse to allow their children to go on these trips? If so, how many? What are their reasons?

8. What feedback have you had from parents in reaction to the bus trips, particularly from those who accompanied trips?

9. What reactions have you had from teachers concerning the educational value of these trips?

10. How is it decided which children go to which trip sites?

11. To what extent do you screen requests or confer with teachers so as to decide on the suitability of a particular trip destination for a particular grade level?

12. What age groups seem most responsive to the bus trips?

13. What discipline problems, if any, have been encountered on these trips?

14. What are the educational purposes of today's trip(s)? If busses are going to more than one trip site today, please comment for each site.

15. How could the educational value of these trips be increased?

16. Can you suggest some places that you think would be valuable for the children to visit?

17. Have you mixed different grade levels on the same bus? If so, was this an asset or a liability? Does it make any difference?

18. What criticisms do you have of the bus trip program in general?

19. Do you think the bus trip program should be continued? Expanded? Why?

20. What suggestions can you offer for improving the bus trip program?

Center for Urban Education
33 West 42nd Street
New York, New York 10036

Title I Evaluations

Educational Bus Trips - Followup Questionnaire

School_____ Teacher in charge of bus observed_____

Grade Taught_____ Date of trip_____

Current Date_____ Trip Destination_____

Dear Teacher:

We would appreciate your answering the following questions, which are related to what happened after the bus trip mentioned above. This additional information will make possible a fuller evaluation of the program.

This would be good time also to thank you for your cooperation and to tell you that our observers all reported a pleasant time on each trip they took.

Yours sincerely,

1. Did you make any bus trips this year under the Title I program before the one listed above?
   _____No
   _____Yes; Please list destinations of Title I trips:

_____

_____

2. To what other places have you taken classes on bus trips in previous years? (If none, check here____.)

_____

_____

3. Have you taken classes on any bus trips since the one listed at the top of this page? If yes, please list destinations.

_____

_____

4. After the trip listed at the top of the page, what steps in the way of followup did you take with your class? (If none, check here____.) Please specify the form of the followup - class discussion, written reports, projects, etc.

5. What reactions did you get from the children after this trip? Please specify or give examples.

6. What reactions did you get from the children's parents after this trip? Again, please specify or give examples.

7. In what ways has this trip changed your ideas on preparing children for bus trips? What would you want to do differently in the future?

8. Do you have any comments in general?

APPENDIX C

Staff List

Dr. Rita Senf, Evaluation Chairman
Senior Research Psychologist
Center for Urban Education

Mrs. May Engler
Research Assistant
Center for Urban Education

Mr. Arthur Freeman
Instructor, Rockland Community College
Psychology

Mr. Stephen Zeigfinger
Research Assistant
Center for Urban Education